



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/630,637	07/29/2003	Michael R. Manzano	TPTC-1-1004	9049

25315 7590 11/27/2007
BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM, PLLC
701 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 4800
SEATTLE, WA 98104

EXAMINER

SEYE, ABDOU K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2194

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

11/27/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/630,637

Applicant(s)

MANZANO, MICHAEL R.

Examiner

Abdou Karim Seye

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 July 2003 and 13 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Art Unit: 2194

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on November 13, 2006 has been received and entered.

Claims 1, 17, 20-21, 27-28, 38 and 44-48 have been amended. The currently pending claims considered below are Claims 1-48.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that forms the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-9, 12-29, 32-33, 38-39 and 44-48 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by **Schneiderman (US 7082604)**.

Claim 1 and 29, Schneiderman teaches, a system, product and method for collecting message objects using a mobile agent object, the method comprising:

receiving a plurality of message objects at an event source platform (FIG. 1, col. 8, lines 50-67; FIG. 3e, col. 11, lines 43-46);

filtering the received message objects with a mobile agent object executing in the event source platform to determine a filtered set of message objects, the mobile agent object operable to execute in a first electronic device, halt execution in the first electronic device at an execution state, be transplanted to a second electronic device, and resume execution from the execution state in the second electronic device (abstract (FIG. 3e; col. 11, lines 41-61); and

delivering the filtered message objects to a collection host platform (FIG. 1; col. 11, lines 55-60).

Claim 2, Schneiderman teaches,

delivering the mobile agent object to the event source platform from the collection host platform via a network connection prior to the filtering (abstract; FIG. 1; a LAN network connection).

Claim 3, Schneiderman teaches,

delivering the mobile agent object to the event source platform via a network from a control device platform via a network connection prior to the filtering (FIG. 3d; a mobile agent factory).

Claim 4, Schneiderman teaches,

Art Unit: 2194

delivering the mobile agent object to a second event source platform from the first event source platform via a network connection prior to delivering the filtered message objects to the collection host platform (FIG. 1; col. 8, lines 50-60).

Claim 5, Schneiderman teaches,

delivering the filtered message objects to a display device platform from the collection host platform via a network connection (col. 7, lines 66-67; col. 8, lines 1-8; display console)

Claim 6, Schneiderman teaches,

delivering the filtered message objects to a control device platform from the collection host platform via a network connection (FIG. 3b, col. 10, lines 18-31).

Claim 7, Schneiderman teaches,

storing the filtered message objects to a message database in the collection host platform (FIG. 1: 14; col. 8, lines 23-27; web server used as storage facility).

Claim 8, Schneiderman teaches,

wherein filtering is in response to an event trigger (FIG. 3b, Col. 10, lines 18-22).

The claimed element "instantiating agents on demand" of Schneiderman's reference meets the claimed limitation of the claim.

Claim 9, Schneiderman teaches,

Art Unit: 2194

wherein the event trigger is the receiving of a message (col. 10, lines 49-67).

Claim 12 Schneiderman teaches,

wherein the message objects comprise digitally encoded text messages (Col. 10, lines 49-67). The claimed element "Instant messenger" meets the claimed limitation of the claim.

Claim 13, Schneiderman teaches,

configuring the mobile agent object at a control device platform; and delivering the mobile agent object to the event source platform prior to the receiving of the plurality of message objects (FIG. 3/b-c, col. 10 lines 18-67).

Claim 14, Schneiderman teaches,

wherein the filtering comprises passing message objects to the filtered set of message objects that have a predetermined recipient (FIG. 2b, col. 9, lines 41-53; FIG. 18, col. 18, lines 41-67; identifying destination server as the recipient ; FIG. 34: 1038; obtain target agent's ID).

Claim 15, Schneiderman teaches,

wherein the filtering comprises passing message objects to the filtered set of message objects that have a predetermined subject matter (col. 11, lines 5-8; established topics).

Art Unit: 2194

Claim 16, Schneiderman teaches,

wherein the filtering comprises passing message objects to the filtered set of message objects that have a predetermined source (FIG. 2b, col. 9, lines 41-53).

Claim 17, Schneiderman teaches,

wherein the filtering comprises passing message objects to the filtered set of message objects that have a predetermined time and date stamp (FIG. 4A, col. 12, lines 32-46).

As per claims 18-20, 21, 28, 22-27, 32-33, 38-39 and 44-48 they are rejected for the same reasons as the claims above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) which forms the basis for all obvious rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2194

5. Claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Schneiderman (US 7082604)**.in view of **Cheyet et al (US 7069560)**.

Claims 10 and 11, 30-31, 34-37, 40-43 Schneiderman teaches , a system product and method for collecting message objects using a mobile agent object as in claims 1 and 29 above. But he does not disclose, wherein the message objects comprise voice-mail messages. However, in the same field of endeavor; mobile agents communication Cheyet teaches a user interface agent that includes voicemail agent; electronic mail agent, a text agent, Fax agent, laptop computer agent (Fig. 5, col. 5, lines 28-31; Fig. 6, col. 8, lines 3-67).Therefore, it would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schneiderman's invention with Cheyet's invention to include voice/electronic mail message and so on for communication involving all agents within a system. One would have been motivated to integrate voice/electronic mail and text messages within distributed system, in order to provide efficient interoperation and cooperation among multiple agents (Cheyet; col. 9, lines 2-15).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed on October 13, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. Claim 1: Applicant argues that, "Schneiderman fails to teach or suggest receiving a plurality of message objects at an event source platform, and filtering the received

Art Unit: 2194

message object with a mobile agent object executing in the event source platform. The examiner disagrees since, Schneiderman teaches in (paragraph 163) an object type that is an agent message associated with a mobile agent process running on a remote machine; and in (paragraph 121) all running mobile agent processes are associated with events that are filtered for the preparation of object creation. Therefore the teaching of Schneiderman's reference meets the claimed limitation of the claim. Also the examiner notes that in (page 10, lines 13-20) that the applicant has not provided an explicit definition of the claimed element "event source platforms" .Therefore the examiner has used the broadest and reasonable interpretation to meet this feature of of the claim .

Conclusion

7. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire

Art Unit: 2194

later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Exr. Abdou Seye whose telephone number is (571) 270-1062. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, contact the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson at (571) 272-3718. The fax phone number for formal or official faxes to Technology Center 3600 is (571) 273-8300. Draft or informal faxes, which will not be entered in the application, may be submitted directly to the examiner at (571) 273-6722. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group Receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-3600

AKS

November 20, 2007



WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER